

EXISTENCE AND NONEXISTENCE OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS OF INDEFINITE ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS IN $\mathbb{R}^N$

MATTHIAS SCHNEIDER

ABSTRACT. Our purpose is to find positive solutions $u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the semilinear elliptic problem $-\Delta u - \lambda V(x)u = h(x)u^{p-1}$ for $2 < p$. The functions V and h may have an indefinite sign and the linearized operator need not to have a first (principal) eigenvalue, e.g. we allow $V \equiv 1$. We give precise existence and nonexistence criteria, which depend on λ and on the growth of h^- and h^+/V^+ . Existence theorems are obtained by constrained minimization. The mountain pass theorem leads to a second solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in finding positive solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u(x) - \lambda V(x)u(x) + h(x)u(x)^{p-1} &= 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ 0 &\not\leq u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|), \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)_\lambda$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a real nonnegative parameter. The functions h and V may change sign. We denote by $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with respect to the norm $(\int |\nabla u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in L^{2^*} , where we set $2^* := 2N/(N-2)$. Moreover, for a given measurable nonnegative function k and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ we will denote by $L^q(\Omega, k)$ the space of measurable functions u satisfying

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega, k)}^p := \int_{\Omega} k(x)|u|^p < \infty,$$

where functions, which are equal $k(x)dx$ -almost everywhere, are identified as usual. For any function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we abbreviate its positive part, $\max(0, f)$, by f^+ and its negative part, $(f^+ - f)$, by f^- . Our basic requirements are

$$N \geq 3, \quad p > 2 \text{ and } h, V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) : V^+ \not\equiv 0 \not\equiv h^+, \quad (1.2)$$

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is compactly embedded in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-), \quad (1.3)$$

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \text{ is compactly embedded in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+). \quad (1.4)$$

We first state some sufficient conditions for the validity of (1.3) and (1.4). Obviously (1.3) holds whenever $h^- \equiv 0$. Moreover, (1.3) is valid under each of the following two assumptions (see [24, Cor. 2.2], for a necessary and sufficient condition see [24, Th. 2.1])

$$p < 2^* \text{ and } h^- \in L^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-p}}(\mathbb{R}^N), \quad (1.5)$$

$$p < 2^*, \quad h^- \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and } \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} h^-(x)|x|^{\frac{N-2}{2}p-N} = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Date: May 2002.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J65, 35D05.

Key words and phrases. Constrained minimization, mountain pass, sign-changing nonlinearity.

Research supported by a S.I.S.S.A. postdoctoral fellowship.

Condition (1.4) holds under each of the following two assumptions (see [24, Th. 2.3]),

$$\exists R > 0 : h(x) > 0 \ \forall |x| \geq R \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V^+ \left(\frac{V^+}{h} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} < \infty, \quad (1.7)$$

$$V^+ \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (1.8)$$

Note that (1.8) is sufficient for $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to be compactly embedded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$, hence (1.4) is satisfied for any h^+ under the assumption (1.8).

Existence results. Equation $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $V \equiv 1$ was investigated on bounded domains Ω with various boundary conditions using bifurcation theory and the method of sub- super-solutions. We mention the work of Amann and López-Gómez [3], López-Gómez [19, 20], Ouyang [21]. They used an abstract result of Crandall and Rabinowitz [13] and showed that $(\lambda_1(\Omega), 0)$ is a bifurcation point for positive solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$, where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian in Ω with corresponding boundary conditions, i.e. there is an open neighborhood U of $(\lambda_1, 0)$ such that every nontrivial solution pair (λ, u) in U is described by a continuous curve $(\lambda(s), u(s))$ emanating from $(\lambda_1(\Omega), 0)$. It was shown that the solution curve is increasing in λ near $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega)$ (supercritical) if and only if

$$\int_{\Omega} h(x) e_1(\Omega)^p > 0, \quad (1.9)$$

where $e_1(\Omega)$ denotes the positive eigenfunction belonging to the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$. Ouyang [21] showed for compact Riemannian manifolds that (1.9) is also necessary for the existence of positive solutions to $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega)$. The interesting point in this situation is that the problem becomes affected by the positive part of h , $h^+ := \max(0, h)$, which pushes up the spectrum of the linearized problem and possibly creates a “ground state” solution.

Alama and Tarantello [1, 2] and Berestycki, Capuzzo Dolcetta and Nirenberg [6, 7] studied $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $V \equiv 1$ on bounded domains Ω . They used variational methods like constrained minimization and a variational formulation of Perron’s sub- super-solution method. Apart from various existence results, (1.9) was derived as a necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of positive solutions to $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega)$ with Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions.

To deal with unbounded domains Ω and general functions V we have to adjust the value $\lambda_1(\Omega)$. To this end we define for measurable $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and V

$$D^{1,2}(\Omega) := \{u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid u = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\},$$

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, V) := \inf \{ \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \mid u \in D^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|), \int V(x) |u|^2 = 1 \}. \quad (1.10)$$

Note that for bounded domains Ω and $V \equiv 1$ the value $\lambda_1(\Omega, V)$ coincides with $\lambda_1(\Omega)$, the usual first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian in Ω . If $\lambda_1(\Omega, V)$ is attained, we will call $\lambda_1(\Omega, V)$ a principal eigenvalue and a corresponding nonnegative minimizer a principal eigenfunction, denoted by $e_1(\Omega, V)$, which satisfies due to its variational characterization

$$\int \nabla e_1(\Omega, V) \nabla \varphi = \lambda_1(\Omega, V) \int V(x) e_1(\Omega, V) \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in D^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|).$$

Harnack’s inequality [25, C.1] shows that if Ω is a domain and V is regular enough, e.g. (1.2), then the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega, V)$, if it exists, is simple and the corresponding eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega, V)$ is positive inside Ω . If $V^+ \in L^{N/2}(\Omega)$ then $\lambda_1(\Omega, V)$ is attained, since $D^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\Omega, V^+)$ in this case (see [24, Cor. 2.4]).

Positive solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ have up to now only been obtained under the assumption that the weight V^+ decreases fast enough at infinity to ensure that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ is a principal eigenvalue with positive eigenfunction $e_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ (see [9, 14, 26]). Cingolani and Gámez [11] proved under the assumptions $V \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $2 < p < 2^*$ and $h \in L^{2^*/(2^*-p)}(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$(1.1)_\lambda \text{ is solvable in a right neighborhood of } \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \text{ if } \int h(x)e_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)^p > 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Costa and Tehrani [12] showed that (1.11) remains valid under the assumptions

$$2 < p < 2^*, V \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ for some } \alpha > N/2 \text{ and } \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} h(x) = h_\infty > 0.$$

Our purpose is to give existence and nonexistence criteria for positive solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ in cases where the linearized operator need not to have a first (principal) eigenvalue, e.g. for $V \equiv 1$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. We emphasize that our approach yields new results even when $V^+ \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and a principal eigenfunction $e_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ exists since we do not impose any growth condition on h^+ and V^- in this case.

We shall find solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ as critical points of $I_\lambda \in C^2(E, \mathbb{R})$, defined by

$$I_\lambda(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int V(x)|u|^2 + \frac{1}{p} \int h(x)|u|^p,$$

where we denote by E the Banach space $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|)$ equipped with the norm $\|u\|_E := \|\nabla u\|_2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|)}$. Under the assumptions (1.3) and (1.4) the space E coincides with $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^-) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ and we may replace its norm by the equivalent norm $\|\nabla u\|_2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^-)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)}$.

For $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ and $h^- \not\equiv 0$ the energy functional I_λ is neither bounded above, nor below and zero is not a local minimum of the energy. To find nontrivial solutions we use a constrained minimization method and apply the mountain pass theorem to a local minimizer of the energy. Conditions (1.3) and (1.4) prevent the possible lack of compactness at infinity. Note that in our framework $I'_\lambda(u)$ need not to be a Fredholm operator from E to E' , see Remark 4.4 for a precise discussion, which leads to additional technical difficulties.

Motivated by the work of Ouyang [21] we define for measurable $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, V, h) := \inf \{ \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \mid u \in D^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|), \int V(x)|u|^2 = 1, \int h(x)|u|^p \leq 0 \}.$$

We set $\lambda_1(\Omega, V, h) = +\infty$, if the infimum is taken over an empty set. Assumptions (1.2)-(1.4) imply that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is attained or equals $+\infty$ (see Lemma 3 below).

We can now formulate our main existence result.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4) hold. Then $(1.1)_\lambda$ has a positive solution $u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in E for all λ such that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$. The solution u is a local minimum of I_λ . If, moreover, h is nonnegative then u is the unique positive solution in E .*

If (1.2) holds, $V^+ \in L^{N/2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $h^- \in L^{2^*/(2^*-p)}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ then $e_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ exists, $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ is simple and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is attained or equals $+\infty$. Consequently

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \text{ if and only if } e_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \notin \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|) \mid \int h(x)|u|^p \leq 0\}.$$

Hence Theorem 1.1 includes the existence results in [11, 12] mentioned above. From our proof it is easy to see that Theorem 1.1 continues to hold for arbitrary domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and that for a bounded domain Ω , $V \equiv 1$ and $h \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ the condition $\lambda_1(\Omega, 1, h) > \lambda_1(\Omega, 1)$

is equivalent to (1.9).

To give our next existence result we need to introduce the set Ω^{-0} , defined by

$$\Omega^{-0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid h(x) \leq 0\}.$$

If h is nonnegative then we have by definition $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and we show

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4) and $h^- \equiv 0$. Then $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and $(1.1)_\lambda$ has a unique positive solution u_λ in E for every $\lambda \in J :=]\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)[$. The map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ belongs to $C^0(J, E)$ and satisfies*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)} u_\lambda = 0, \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)} \|u_\lambda\|_E = \infty.$$

Furthermore, $(1.1)_\lambda$ does not admit any positive solution in E if $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$.

The continuity of $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is proven merely by hands since we cannot apply the implicit function theorem, which is mainly due to the fact that $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ fails to be a Fredholm operator (see Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.4).

If V is nonnegative then the blow-up behavior of u_λ as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is given by

Theorem 1.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, if moreover V is nonnegative, Ω^{-0} is bounded and $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \infty$, then we obtain the pointwise growth estimate*

$$u_\lambda(x) \geq \frac{(\lambda - \mu)C}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) - \lambda} e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)(x) + u_\mu(x),$$

for any $\mu \in J$, any principal eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and some $C = C(e_1, \mu) > 0$.

The analogous result for bounded domains was obtained in [15] using that u_λ is differentiable as a function of λ . We are able to extend their result replacing $(d/d\lambda)u_\lambda$ by corresponding difference quotients.

If $h^- \not\equiv 0$, it is possible to find a second positive solution thanks to the mountain pass theorem [4]. We prove

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4), $h^- \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$. Then for every $\lambda \in J^- :=]\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)[$ equation $(1.1)_\lambda$ admits an ordered pair of positive solutions $u_\lambda < v_\lambda$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u_\lambda) &< 0 \text{ and } (I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in E, \\ I_\lambda(v_\lambda) &> 0 \text{ and } (I''_\lambda(v_\lambda)v_\lambda, v_\lambda) < 0 \text{ for all } \lambda \in J^- \setminus \{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)\}, \\ I_\lambda(v_\lambda) &= 0 = (I''_\lambda(v_\lambda)v_\lambda, v_\lambda) \text{ if } \lambda = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the quantity λ^* , defined by

$$\lambda^* := \sup \{ \lambda \mid \lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \text{ and } (1.1)_\lambda \text{ admits a solution in } E \}.$$

Theorem 1.2 shows that $\lambda^* = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ if h is nonnegative. Ouyang [21] discussed $(1.1)_\lambda$ on compact Riemannian manifolds M with $V \equiv 1$ and showed that if $h^- \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1(M) < \lambda_1(M, 1, h)$ then $\lambda^* > \lambda_1(M, 1, h)$ and $(1.1)_\lambda$ admits a unique positive solution in E for $\lambda = \lambda^*$ and at most two ordered positive solution for $\lambda_1(M) < \lambda < \lambda^*$. The proof consists of a delicate bifurcation analysis which does not work under our assumptions. A result in the spirit of [21] is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4), $V \geq 0$, $h^- \not\equiv 0$, $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ and*

$$0 < \int h^-(x) e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)^p$$

for some principal eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Then

(i) If $\lambda \in [\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda^*]$, then $(1.1)_\lambda$ has a positive solution $u_\lambda \in E$ such that

$$I_\lambda(u_\lambda) < 0 \text{ and } (I''(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in E,$$

(ii) $\lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and $(1.1)_\lambda$ does not admit any positive solution in E if $\lambda > \lambda^*$.

Obviously we have $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \leq \lambda^*$. To see that λ^* could be arbitrary close to $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ we discuss the dependence of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ on h^+ showing

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4) hold and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is finite. We define for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ the function $h_\mu := \mu h^+ - h^-$. Then*

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_\mu) \rightarrow \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) \text{ as } \mu \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.12)$$

Moreover, if $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \infty$, then $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is attained.

Theorem 1.1 extends to rather general nonlinearities (see [23]), because the solution is a local minimizer of the variational functional and may be found whenever the nonlinearity is weakly lower semicontinuous. Whereas the proof of the Palais-Smale condition becomes a delicate issue in presence of a general sign changing nonlinearity (see [1, 22]). A version of Theorem 1.5 for special classes of nonlinearities, e.g. $h(x)g(u)$, is given in [23].

Nonexistence results. Roughly speaking there are two obstructions to the existence of (weak) solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$. The quotient h^+/V^+ has to grow at infinity to ensure the compactness of the inclusion of $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$ and the parameter λ must not exceed $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. We will prove

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose (1.2). Then $(1.1)_\lambda$ does not admit any positive weak solution in E for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$.*

Furthermore, if $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \infty$ is attained and $h \not\equiv 0$, then there is no positive weak solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ in E for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$.

If h is nonnegative then $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and in this case our results for λ are optimal. Moreover, the assumption $h^+ \not\equiv 0$ is necessary because otherwise $\Omega^{-0} = \mathbb{R}^N$ and no solution exist for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$.

In some cases the existence of a positive solution to $(1.1)_\lambda$ in E for $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ implies the compactness of the embedding in (1.4). To our knowledge such a connection has never been observed in the literature before. Besides such rather abstract results we show that the existence of positive solutions leads to integrability conditions on V and h regaining (1.7) as a necessary condition. A related result in dimension $N = 1$ can be found in [17]. We state our main result, which will be proven below.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.3) and*

$$0 < \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(x)}{|x|^\alpha} \leq \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(x)}{|x|^\alpha} < \infty \text{ for some } \alpha > -2, \quad (1.13)$$

$$0 < \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(x)}{|x|^\beta} \leq \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(x)}{|x|^\beta} < \infty \text{ for some } \beta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.14)$$

Then $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = 0$ and (1.4) is equivalent to each of the following two conditions

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) > 0 \text{ and } (1.1)_\lambda \text{ is solvable for all } \lambda \text{ such that } 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h), \quad (1.15)$$

$$(1.1)_\lambda \text{ is solvable for some } \lambda > 0. \quad (1.16)$$

If, moreover, $(N - 4) \leq \alpha$, then (1.4), (1.15) and (1.16) are equivalent to (1.7).

2. NONEXISTENCE

We call u a weak super solution of $-\Delta u + g(x, u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, if $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$\int \nabla u \nabla \varphi + \int g(x, u(x)) \varphi \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \varphi \geq 0.$$

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose (1.2) and*

$$(1.1)_\lambda \text{ has a weak positive super solution } u_0 \text{ for some } \lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \quad (2.1)$$

such that $u_0 \in C(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$.

Then there is a positive solution $u_1 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of $(1.1)_\lambda$ in E such that $I_\lambda(u_1) < 0$ and

$$(I_\lambda''(u_1)v, v) = \int |\nabla v|^2 - \lambda \int V(x)|v|^2 + (p-1) \int h(x)|u_1|^{p-2}|v|^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in E. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. We begin by proving the claim under the additional assumption that

$$u_0 \text{ does not solve the equation in } (1.1)_\lambda. \quad (2.3)$$

To this end we consider the set $M := \{u \in E \mid 0 \leq u(x) \leq u_0(x) \text{ a.e.}\}$ and try to minimize I_λ in the convex set M . Because $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ we may choose $R > 0$ large enough such that $\lambda > \lambda_1(B_R(0), V)$. Because $V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N)$, a positive minimizer $e_1(B_R(0), V) \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\lambda_1(B_R(0), V)$ exists. Due to the fact that $t \cdot e_1(B_R(0), V)$ is an element of M for small values of t and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$ we have $-\infty < \inf_{u \in M} I_\lambda(u) < 0$. Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for $\inf_{u \in M} I_\lambda(u)$. Because $0 \leq u_n \leq u_0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$ the functions $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$. From the boundedness of $(I_\lambda(u_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ we derive that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . We may assume $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E to some $u_1 \in E$ and pointwise almost everywhere. Since M is convex, M is weakly closed and $u_1 \in M$. By the dominated convergence theorem we see that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges strongly to u_1 in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$. Fatou's lemma now yields $I(u_1) \leq \inf_{u \in M} I(u) < 0$. By Perron's method (see [27, Thm. 2.4]) the function u_1 is a weak solution of $-\Delta u - V(x)u + h(x)u^{p-1} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

By standard regularity results and Harnack's inequality (see for instance [25, C.1]) the function u_1 is strictly positive and an element of $C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. (2.3) ensures $u_1 \neq u_0$. Consider the nonnegative function $w := u_0 - u_1$. Clearly w solves $-\Delta w + (-\lambda V(x) + h(x)g(x))w = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, where g is a continuous function, defined by

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{u_1^{p-2}(x) - u_0^{p-2}(x)}{u_1(x) - u_0(x)} & \text{if } u_1(x) > u_0(x), \\ (p-2)u_1(x)^{p-3} & \text{if } u_1(x) = u_0(x). \end{cases}$$

Hence we may again apply Harnack's inequality to see that $u_1(x) < u_0(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus $(I_\lambda''(u_1)\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0$ for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and by density for all $v \in E$.

Now suppose u_0 is a solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$. In this case we consider the equation

$$-\Delta u - \lambda V(x)u + h(x)u^{p-1} + \frac{1}{n}h^+(x)u^{p-1} = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (2.4)_n$$

with the corresponding energy functional J_n , defined by $J_n(u) = I_\lambda(u) + \frac{1}{np} \int h^+(x)|u|^p$. The function u_0 is a strict super solution of $(2.4)_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We now apply the same reasoning as above to obtain a sequence of solutions $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to $(2.4)_n$ such that each v_n satisfies (2.2) with I_λ replaced by J_n . From $J_n(v_n) \leq J_1(v_1) < 0$ and $0 \leq v_n \leq u_0$ we conclude that $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . By passing to a subsequence we may assume

$(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E to some $u_1 \in E$ and pointwise almost everywhere. By the dominated convergence theorem and Fatou's lemma we conclude

$$I_\lambda(u_1) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_\lambda(v_n) \leq J_1(v_1) < 0.$$

The weak convergence implies that u_1 is a critical point of I_λ . Regularity results and Harnack's inequality [25] show $u_1 \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$. Fix $w \in E$. By Hölder's inequality we have for arbitrary $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$

$$\int_\Omega |h(x)| |v_n|^{p-2} |w|^2 \leq \left(\int_\Omega |h(x)| |v_n|^p \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \left(\int_\Omega |h(x)| |w|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq C \left(\int_\Omega |h(x)| |w|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

We observe that the last term becomes small whenever $|\Omega|$ is small or $\Omega \cap B_R(0) = \emptyset$ for large $R > 0$. Since $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges pointwise almost everywhere, we may apply Vitali's theorem [16, Thm. 13.38] to get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h^+(x) |v_n|^{p-2} |w|^2 = \int h^+(x) |u_1|^{p-2} |w|^2 \text{ and } (I_\lambda''(u_1)w, w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (J_n''(v_n)w, w) \geq 0.$$

□

Corollary 2.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 there holds*

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^-) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \text{ is continuously embedded in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+). \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. By (2.2) and Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int V^+(x) |\varphi|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 + \int V^-(x) |\varphi|^2 + \frac{p-1}{\lambda} \int h^+(x) u_1^{p-2} |\varphi|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2 + \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^-)}^2 + \frac{p-1}{\lambda} \|u_1\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)}^{p-2} \|\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows because $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in the involved spaces. □

The next lemma gives some information concerning the behavior of sequences which converge weakly to zero in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 any sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in E , such that*

$$u_n \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \text{ and } \int |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \int V(x) |u_n|^2, \quad (2.6)$$

satisfies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V(x) |u_n|^2 \leq 0$.

Proof. Suppose the assertion of the lemma is false. By passing to a subsequence we may assume that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero pointwise almost everywhere and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V(x) |u_n|^2 > 0. \quad (2.7)$$

By Lemma 2.1 there exists $w \in E$ satisfying (2.2). We use Vitali's theorem as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 to see that

$$\int h^+(x) |w(x)|^{p-2} |u_n|^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.8)$$

By (2.6), (2.8) and (2.2) we have

$$0 \leq \int |\nabla u_n|^2 - \lambda \int V(x) |u_n|^2 + (p-1) \int h^+(x) |w|^{p-2} |u_n|^2 \leq -\frac{\lambda}{2} \int V(x) |u_n|^2 + o(1),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, contrary to (2.7). □

Corollary 2.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1, if moreover*

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ is continuously embedded in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-), \quad (2.9)$$

then we have $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) > 0$.

Proof. Suppose contrary to our claim $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) = 0$. Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$, i.e.

$$\int V(x)|u_n|^2 = 1, \quad \int h(x)|u_n|^p \leq 0 \text{ and } \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Clearly $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We conclude from (2.9) that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|)$. Passing to a subsequence we may assume that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to zero in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$. Lemma 2.3 tells us that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V(x)|u_n|^2 \leq 0$ contradicting (2.10). $\square$

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose (1.2) and (2.1). Moreover, we assume*

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, |h|) \text{ is compactly embedded in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^-), \quad (2.11)$$

there exist $\varepsilon < 2$, $c_1 > 0$ and for each $R > 2$ there are a positive constant C_R and a nonnegative function h_R such that

$$c_1 R^{-\varepsilon} V^+(x) \leq V^+(R \cdot x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (2.12)$$

$$h^+(R \cdot x) \leq C_R h^+(x) + h_R(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ and} \quad (2.13)$$

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \text{ is continuously embedded in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h_R). \quad (2.14)$$

Then $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$.

Proof. For $u \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$ we write $u_R(x) := R^{(\varepsilon-N)/2} u(x/R)$ and deduce by (2.12) and (2.13) for $R > 2$

$$\int V^+(x)|u|^2 \leq c_1^{-1} R^\varepsilon \int V^+(R \cdot x)|u|^2 = c_1^{-1} \int V^+(x)|u_R|^2, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\int h^+(x)|u_R|^p \leq R^{\frac{p\varepsilon}{2}-N\frac{p-2}{2}} \int h^+(R \cdot x)|u|^p \leq C'_R \int h^+(x)|u|^p + C'_R \int h_R(x)|u|^p, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\int |\nabla u_R|^2 = R^{\varepsilon-2} \int |\nabla u|^2. \quad (2.17)$$

Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ converging weakly to zero. The assertion of the theorem follows if we show that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$. Conversely, by passing to a subsequence, suppose that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \text{ exists and is positive.} \quad (2.18)$$

First we show that (2.18) leads to a contradiction under the additional assumption that

$$\int |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.19)$$

By (2.11) the sequence of integrals $\int V^-(x)|u_n|^2$ converges to zero. Consequently Lemma 2.3 and (2.19) yield $\int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, contrary to (2.18).

To complete the proof we suppose

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int |\nabla u_n|^2}{\int V^+(x)|u_n|^2} =: \Lambda \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

If $\Lambda = \infty$, then obviously $\int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $\|\nabla u_n\|_2$ is uniformly bounded in n . If $\Lambda < \infty$, then we take $R \geq (3\Lambda/\lambda c_1)^{1/(2-\varepsilon)}$ and

$$v_n(x) := u_{n,R}(x) = R^{(\varepsilon-N)/2} u_n(x/R) \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.20)$$

By (2.16) and (2.17) the sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ and converges weakly to zero in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Thus by passing to a subsequence we may assume $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to zero in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$. From (2.15) and (2.17) we deduce

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int |\nabla v_n|^2}{\int V^+(x)|v_n|^2} \leq \frac{\lambda c_1}{3\Lambda c_1} \frac{\int |\nabla u_n|^2}{\int V^+(x)|u_n|^2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{3}. \quad (2.21)$$

From the above analysis we conclude $\int V^+(x)|v_n|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence by (2.15) we have $\int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, contrary to (2.18). $\square$

Remark 2.6. Using (2.20) and (2.21) in the proof of Proposition 2.5 we easily obtain that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = 0$ under the assumption (2.12).

Corollary 2.7. Suppose (1.2), (2.1) and (1.13)-(1.14). Then $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$.

Proof. We may estimate for $R \geq 1$ by (1.14)

$$h^+(R \cdot x) \leq c_R h^+(x) + \|h^+ \cdot \chi_{B_{M \cdot R}(0)}\|_\infty \cdot \chi_{B_{M \cdot R}(0)}(x) \text{ for some } M > 0. \quad (2.22)$$

By (1.13) we may find positive constants $C_2 > 2$, $0 < c_1^- < c_1^+$ such that

$$c_1^- |x|^\alpha \leq V(x) \leq c_1^+ |x|^\alpha \quad \text{for all } |x| \geq C_2. \quad (2.23)$$

Define $V_0 : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$V_0(x) := \begin{cases} c_1^- |x|^\alpha & \text{if } C_2 + 1 \leq |x| \\ c_1^- (|x|^\alpha - C_2^\alpha) & \text{if } C_2 \leq |x| \leq C_2 + 1 \\ \min(V(x), 0) & \text{if } |x| \leq C_2. \end{cases}$$

We may estimate for all $|x| \geq C_2 + 1$ and $R \geq 1$

$$\frac{V_0(x)}{V_0(Rx)} \leq R^{-\alpha}.$$

For $C_2 \leq |x| \leq C_2 + 1$ and $R \geq 2$ we have since $C_2 > 2$

$$\frac{V_0(x)}{V_0(Rx)} \leq \frac{c_1^- (|C_2 + 1|^\alpha - C_2^\alpha)}{c_1^- R^\alpha C_2^\alpha}$$

Putting together the two above observations we obtain for all $R > 2$

$$\frac{C_2^\alpha}{(|C_2 + 1|^\alpha - C_2^\alpha)} R^\alpha V_0^+(x) \leq V_0^+(Rx) \quad (2.24)$$

By Remark 2.6 we obtain $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V_0) = 0$. Since $V_0 \leq V$ and (2.22)-(2.24) hold, Proposition 2.5 applied to V_0 and h gives

$$D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \text{ is compactly embedded in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V_0^+). \quad (2.25)$$

Since V^+ is smaller than $(c_1^-)^{-1} c_1^+ V_0^+$ outside a bounded domain, (2.25) remains true if we replace V_0^+ by V^+ . $\square$

To prove that (1.15)-(1.16) are equivalent to (1.7) we need

Lemma 2.8. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.1, if moreover there exists $R > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} V, h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}), \quad h(x) > 0 \quad \forall |x| \geq R, \quad \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V^+(x)}{h(x)} = 0, \\ \Delta \left(\frac{V^+(x)}{h(x)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid V(x) > 0, |x| > R\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Then the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V^+ \left(\frac{V^+}{h} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}$ is finite.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1 and standard regularity results we may assume u_0 solves $(1.1)_\lambda$ and $u_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}) \cap E$. For abbreviation we write $w(x)$ instead of $(V^+(x)/h(x))^{1/(p-2)}$. Because u_0 is a positive function we may choose $\sigma > 0$ such that $\lambda > \sigma$ and

$$u_0(x) > (\lambda - \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} w(x) \quad \text{in } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid |x| = R\}.$$

We will denote by Ω_σ the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid -\Delta u_0 - \sigma V(x)u_0 > 0, |x| > R\}$. Because u_0 is a solution to $(1.1)_\lambda$ an easy calculation shows

$$x \in \Omega_\sigma \iff h(x)u_0(x)^{p-2} < (\lambda - \sigma)V(x) \iff u_0(x) < (\lambda - \sigma)^{\frac{1}{p-2}} w(x) \quad \text{and } \overline{\Omega_\sigma} \subset \Omega_+.$$

The basic idea of the proof is to show that Ω_σ is empty. Conversely, suppose that there is $x_0 \in \Omega_\sigma$, i.e. $|x_0| > R$ and

$$u_0(x_0) - (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w(x_0) = -\varepsilon \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (2.27)$$

From (2.26) we may choose $R_1 > |x_0|$ large enough to have $u_0(x) - (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w(x) > -\varepsilon/2$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega_\sigma}$ satisfying $|x| = R_1$. With the notation $\Omega_* := \Omega_\sigma \cap B_{R_1}(0)$ we have

$$\inf_{x \in \partial\Omega_*} \left(u_0(x) - (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w(x) \right) \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and } \Delta(u_0 - (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w) \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_*. \quad (2.28)$$

By (2.28) and the maximum principle we deduce $u_0(x) - (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w(x) \geq -\varepsilon/2$ for all $x \in \Omega_*$, contrary to (2.27).

Consequently, we have $u_0(x) \geq (\lambda - \sigma)^{1/(p-2)} w(x)$ for all x satisfying $|x| \geq R$ and we may estimate

$$\infty > \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V^+(x) u_0^2 \geq (\lambda - \sigma)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V^+ \left(\frac{V^+}{h} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}.$$

□

Corollary 2.9. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 2.1, given any functions h_0 and V_0 satisfying (2.26) such that*

$$h_0(x) \geq h(x) \quad \text{and } V_0(x) \leq V(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\exists 0 \leq \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \lambda \int V_0(x) |\varphi|^2 < 0, \quad (2.30)$$

then the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V_0^+ \left(\frac{V_0^+}{h_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}$ is finite for some $R > 0$.

Proof. By (2.29) the function u_0 is a super solution of $-\Delta u - V_0(x)u + h_0(x)u^{p-1} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. From (2.30) we conclude $\lambda > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V_0)$. Hence we may apply Lemma 2.8 with h and V replaced by h_0 and V_0 . □

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose (1.2), (2.20), (1.13)-(1.14) and $(N-4) \leq \alpha$, where α is given in (1.13). Then we have for some $R > 0$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V^+ \left(\frac{V^+}{h} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} < \infty.$$

Proof. An easy computation shows that the claim of the proposition holds if and only if $(\beta - \alpha) > (N/2 + \alpha/2)(p - 2)$. Conversely, suppose that $(\beta - \alpha) \leq (N/2 + \alpha/2)(p - 2)$. Since $(N - 4) \leq \alpha$ there holds

$$(N - 2)(p - 2) \leq \left(\frac{N}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) (p - 2). \quad (2.31)$$

By direct calculation we obtain

$$\Delta \left(|x|^{-\frac{\beta-\alpha}{p-2}} \right) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \neq 0 \text{ if } (\beta - \alpha) \geq (N - 2)(p - 2). \quad (2.32)$$

From (2.31) it is possible to choose $\beta' \geq \beta$ such that

$$(N - 2)(p - 2) \leq (\beta' - \alpha) \leq (N/2 + \alpha/2)(p - 2). \quad (2.33)$$

Consider the functions h_0 and V_0 defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(x) &:= \max(C_2|x|^{\beta'}\chi_{|x|>R} + C_2R^{\beta'}\chi_{|x|\leq R}, h(x)), \\ V_0(x) &:= \min(C_1|x|^\alpha\chi_{|x|>R} + C_1R^\alpha\chi_{|x|\leq R}, V(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Take an arbitrary nonnegative $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$ and define for $t > 0$ the function $\varphi_t(x) := t^{(2-N)/2}\varphi(x/t)$. Then $\|\nabla \varphi_t\|_2 = \|\nabla \varphi\|_2$ for all t and since $\alpha > -2$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} |x|^\alpha |\varphi_t(x)|^2 = t^{2+\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{R/t}(0)} |x|^\alpha |\varphi(x)|^2 \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.34)$$

Hence $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V_0) = 0$ and we may apply Corollary 2.9 to see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} V_0^+ \left(\frac{V_0^+}{h_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} < \infty.$$

Thus $(\beta' - \alpha) > (N/2 + \alpha/2)(p - 2)$, contrary to (2.33). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Analysis similar to that in the proof of Proposition 2.10 in (2.34) leads to $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = 0$.

Obviously (1.16) is a consequence of (1.15). If (1.16) holds, then Corollary 2.7 shows that (1.4) is satisfied. If (1.4) holds, then by Lemma 3.1 below we have $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) > 0$. Consequently Theorem 1.1 yields (1.15). The last part of our claim is true by applying Proposition 2.10 and since (1.7) is a sufficient condition for (1.4). $\square$

SPECTRAL CONDITIONS

The contents of the next lemma is the relation of positive solutions to the first eigenvalue of linear problems. It is known and can be derived by testing $-\Delta u_0 = k(x)u_0$ with φ^2/u_0 and Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality.

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose there exists a continuous, positive weak super solution $u_0 > 0$ of $-\Delta u = k(x)u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, where $k \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then*

$$\int k(x)\varphi^2 \leq \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N). \quad (2.35)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Suppose (λ, u) solves $(1.1)_\lambda$. The fact, that $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in the space $E_u := D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+ u^{p-2})$ and Lemma 2.11 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda} &\geq \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int \left(V(x) - \frac{h(x)u^{p-2}}{\lambda} \right) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} \geq \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int \left(V(x) - \frac{h^+(x)u^{p-2}}{\lambda} \right) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in E_u \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int \left(V(x) - \frac{h^+(x)u^{p-2}}{\lambda} \right) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} \geq \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \\ \varphi \neq 0 \\ \varphi(x)=0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega^{-0}}} \frac{\int V(x) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Now suppose $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \infty$ is attained by v_0 and u is a solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. The above calculation shows for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)} = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in D^{1,2} \cap L^2(|V|) \cap L^2(h^+ u^{p-2}) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int \left(V(x) - \frac{h^+(x)u^{p-2}}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)} \right) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} = \frac{\int V(x) v_0^2}{\|\nabla v_0\|_2^2}. \quad (2.37)$$

Consequently v_0 weakly solves

$$-\Delta v_0(x) - \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)V(x)v_0(x) + h^+(x)u^{p-2}(x)v_0(x) = 0 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Harnack's inequality and a regularity result in [25, C.1] imply $v_0(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Hence $h^+ \equiv 0$ and $\Omega^{-0} = \mathbb{R}^N$.

Since $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|)$ and by (2.36)-(2.37)

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)} = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int \left(V(x) - \frac{h(x)u^{p-2}}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)} \right) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \\ \varphi \neq 0}} \frac{\int V(x) \varphi^2}{\|\nabla \varphi\|_2^2} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)}.$$

Hence $\int h^-(x)u^{p-2}v_0^2 = 0$ and $h^- \equiv 0$, which is impossible. $\square$

3. BEHAVIOR OF λ_1

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4) hold and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is finite. Then $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is attained by some nonnegative $u_0 \in E$.*

Proof. Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence for $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$. Because the inclusions of $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$ and $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$ are compact, we see that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . Hence we may assume $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E to some $u_0 \in E$. Due to the compactness of the above embeddings we have $\int V(x)|u_0|^2 \geq 1$, $\int h(x)|u_0|^p \leq 0$ and $\|\nabla u_0\|^2 \leq \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$. The rest of the claim follows after appropriate scaling and replacing u_0 by $|u_0|$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.6. By definition $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_\mu) \leq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ for all $\mu \geq 1$ and the value $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_\mu)$ is monotone increasing in μ . Therefore

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_\mu) =: \Lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V).$$

If $\Lambda = +\infty$ then obviously the claim is true. Hence we may assume $\Lambda < \infty$. Consider $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where u_n is the minimizer of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_n)$ found in Lemma 3.1. Analysis similar

to that in the proof of Lemma 3.1 yields that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E and by passing to subsequence we may assume

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ in } E, \quad \int V^+(x)|u_n|^2 \rightarrow \int V^+(x)|u_0|^2 \text{ and } \int V|u_0|^2 \geq 1.$$

Because $\int h^-(x)|u_n|^p$ is bounded, we see $\int h^+(x)|u_n|^p \leq \frac{C}{n}$. From that we conclude

$$0 \leq \int h^+(x)|u_0|^p \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h^+(x)|u_n|^p \leq 0,$$

hence that $u_0(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega^{-0}$, and finally that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) \leq \|\nabla u_0\|_2^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h_n) = \Lambda \leq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V).$$

□

4. EXISTENCE OF A LOCAL MINIMIZER

The existence of a minimizer in an open subset of E is proved by

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4) and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ hold. Then the value*

$$\sigma(\lambda) := \inf \left\{ I_\lambda(u) \mid \frac{\int V(x)|u|^2}{\|\nabla u\|_2^2} > \frac{1}{\lambda}, u \in E \setminus \{0\} \right\} \quad (4.1)$$

is negative and attained by some nonnegative $u_0 \in E$.

Proof. Because $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda$, there is a $\tilde{u} \in E$ such that

$$\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_2^2 - \lambda \int V|\tilde{u}|^2 < 0.$$

Hence we have $I_\lambda(t\tilde{u}) < 0$ for small positive t and $\sigma(\lambda) < 0$.

Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a minimizing sequence. To obtain a contradiction, suppose

$$0 \leq s_n^2 := \int V(x)|u_n|^2 \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.2)$$

Write $v_n := \frac{u_n}{s_n}$. The sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by (4.1) and we conclude for large n

$$0 > \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla v_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{s_n^{p-2}}{p} \int h(x)|v_n|^p$$

Consequently we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h(x)|v_n|^p \leq 0$. By (1.3)-(1.4) we see $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E and by passing to a subsequence and (1.3) we may assume

$$\int h(x)|v_0|^p \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h(x)|v_n|^p \leq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

(1.4) leads to $\int V(x)|v_0|^2 \geq 1$. Finally $\|\nabla v_0\|_2^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla v_n\|_2^2 \leq \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ contradicts the definition of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$.

Hence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, therefore $\int h^-(x)|u_n|^p$ is bounded due to (1.3). Because $I_\lambda(u_n) < 0$ for large n we may deduce that $\int h^+(x)|u_n|^p$ is bounded. From (1.4) we infer that $\int |V(x)||u|^2$ is bounded, consequently $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . Taking a subsequence we may assume $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E and strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$ to some $u_0 \in E$. Thus

$$I_\lambda(u_0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_\lambda(u_n) = \sigma(\lambda) < 0 \text{ and } \|\nabla u_0\|_2^2 - \lambda \int V(x)|u_0|^2 \leq 0.$$

If $\|\nabla u_0\|_2^2 = \lambda \int V(x)|u_0|^2$ then due to the definition of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ we have $\int h(x)|u_0|^p \geq 0$ and consequently $I_\lambda(u_0) \geq 0$ which is impossible. Hence $|u_0|$ minimizes $\sigma(\lambda)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The part of our claim concerning existence is an obvious consequence of Lemma 4.1.

Suppose contrary to our claim that $h \geq 0$ and $u \neq v$ are two positive solutions of $(1.1)_\lambda$ in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap E$. A direct computation shows that $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^N)$, defined by

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{u^{p-1}(x) - v^{p-1}(x)}{u(x) - v(x)} & \text{if } u(x) \neq v(x), \\ (p-1)u^{p-2}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $f(x) > u^{p-2}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We write $w = u - v$. Suppose $w(x_0) \neq 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega^{-0}$. Then we obtain a contradiction by using (2.35) and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (I'_\lambda(u) - I'_\lambda(v))w = \int |\nabla w|^2 - \lambda \int V(x)w^2 + \int h(x)f(x)w^2 \\ &> \int |\nabla w|^2 - \lambda \int V(x)w^2 + \int h(x)u^{p-2}w^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $w(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega^{-0}$ and $\|\nabla w\|_2^2 = \lambda \int V(x)w^2$, contrary to $\lambda < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. $\square$

Remark 4.2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 we obtain a solution u_λ of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for every $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ as local minimizer of I_λ , i.e.

$$I_\lambda(u_\lambda) = \inf \left\{ I_\lambda(u) \mid \frac{\int V(x)|u|^2}{\|\nabla u\|_2^2} > \frac{1}{\lambda}, u \in E \setminus \{0\} \right\}.$$

Consequently we have

$$I_{\lambda'}(u_{\lambda'}) \leq I_\lambda(u_\lambda) - (\lambda' - \lambda) \int V(x)|u_\lambda|^2 \leq I_\lambda(u_\lambda) \text{ if } \lambda \leq \lambda'. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. To obtain a contradiction we suppose $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Obviously $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ is finite. Hence by Lemma 1.6 the value $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is attained by some function $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Because $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) = \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ the function $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is a weak solution of $-\Delta u = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)V(x)u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Harnack's inequality yields $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is positive in $\mathbb{R}^N$, which is impossible. Existence and uniqueness follow from Theorem 1.1. We observe for any $\mu < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$

$$\sup_{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda \leq \mu} \|u_\lambda\|_E < \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

To show (4.5) we proceed analogously to the proof of Lemma 4.1 and assume, contrary to (4.5), that there is a sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|u_{\lambda_n}\|_E \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lambda_n \rightarrow \mu < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Because h is nonnegative and $I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) < 0$ we obtain $s_n^2 := \int V(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $v_n := u_{\lambda_n}/s_n$ and get

$$0 \geq \frac{I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n})}{s_n^2} = \frac{1}{2}\|v_n\|^2 - \frac{\lambda_n}{2} + \frac{s_n^{p-2}}{p} \int h(x)|v_n|^p. \quad (4.6)$$

Consequently $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E and passing to a subsequence we may assume $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E to v_0 . We have $v_0 \neq 0$, because

$$\int V(x)|v_0|^2 \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V(x)|v_n|^2 = 1.$$

Finally $\int h(x)|v_0|^p = 0$ and $\|\nabla v_0\|_2^2 \leq \mu$ contradict the definition of $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$.

Fix $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda \in (\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To obtain a contradiction we suppose

$$\|u_{\lambda_n} - u_\lambda\|_E \geq \varepsilon \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and some } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (4.7)$$

From (4.4) we infer

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) < 0. \quad (4.8)$$

By (4.5) the sequence $(u_{\lambda_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . Passing to a subsequence we may assume $(u_{\lambda_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E and strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$ to some $u_0 \in E$. The function u_0 is a weak nonnegative solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ and $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ because

$$I_\lambda(u_0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) < 0.$$

Uniqueness of positive solution gives $u_0 = u_\lambda$. We may estimate using the strong convergence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= I'_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n})u_{\lambda_n} - I'_\lambda(u_\lambda)u_\lambda \\ &= (\|\nabla u_{\lambda_n}\|_2^2 - \|\nabla u_\lambda\|_2^2) + \lambda_n \left(\int V^-(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 - \int V^-(x)|u_\lambda|^2 \right) + \underbrace{(\lambda_n - \lambda) \int V^-(x)|u_\lambda|^2}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\left(\lambda_n \int V^+(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 - \lambda \int V^+(x)|u_\lambda|^2 \right)}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty} + \left(\int h(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^p - \int h(x)|u_\lambda|^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the uniform convexity of the involved spaces shows that $u_{\lambda_n} \rightarrow u_\lambda$ in E as $n \rightarrow \infty$, contradicting (4.7).

Fix $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By (4.5) we see

$$0 \geq I_\lambda(u_\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u_\lambda\|_2^2 - \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \int V(x)|u_\lambda|^2 + \frac{1}{p} \int h(x)|u_\lambda|^p + o(1)_{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Hence $u_{\lambda_n} \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int V(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Passing to a subsequence we may assume $(u_{\lambda_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E to some $u_0 \neq 0$ satisfying

$$\|\nabla u_0\|_2^2 - \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) \int V(x)|u_0|^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) \leq 0,$$

contradicting $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ and $\int h(x)|u_0|^p = 0$. Consequently from (4.9) we deduce that $u_{\lambda_n} \rightarrow 0$ in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V^+)$. We use again the fact that $I_\lambda(u_\lambda) < 0$ to see that

$$\int V^-(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 \leq \int V^+(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \left(\|\nabla u_{\lambda_n}\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{p} \int h(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^p \right),$$

which finally gives $u_{\lambda_n} \rightarrow 0$ in E .

Fix $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) = \infty$, then by (4.4) we see $I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) \rightarrow -\infty$ and

$$-\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) - \frac{1}{2} I'_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n})u_{\lambda_n} = \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int h(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^p.$$

Consequently $\int h(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Suppose $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \infty$ and $(u_{\lambda_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E . Thus by passing to a subsequence we may assume that $(u_{\lambda_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to u_0 in E . By (4.4)

$$I_{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)}(u_0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) < 0.$$

Thus $u_0 \neq 0$ is a nonnegative weak solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$, which is impossible due to Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 1.6. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 the operator $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda) : E \rightarrow E'$ is injective. If, moreover,*

$$L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+) \not\hookrightarrow D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|), \text{ i.e. } D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|) \neq E \quad (4.10)$$

then the inverse of $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$, defined on $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)(E)$, is not continuous.

Proof. To show the injectivity it is enough to prove that

$$(I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) > 0 \text{ for every } \varphi \in E \setminus \{0\}. \quad (4.11)$$

By (2.35) applied to $k(x) := \lambda V(x) - h(x)u_\lambda^{p-2}$ we obtain

$$F(\varphi) := \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \lambda \int V(x)\varphi^2 + \int h(x)u_\lambda^{p-2}(x)\varphi^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in E.$$

We may write

$$(I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) = F(\varphi) + (p-2) \int h(x)u_\lambda^{p-2}(x)\varphi^2.$$

Thus $(I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) > 0$ for every $\varphi \notin D^{1,2}(\Omega^{-0})$. For $\varphi \in D^{1,2}(\Omega^{-0})$ we obtain

$$(I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) = \int |\nabla \varphi|^2 - \lambda \int V(x)\varphi^2 \geq (\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) - \lambda) \int |\nabla \varphi|^2,$$

and (4.11) follows.

To prove the second part of our claim we take a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset E$ such that $\|\varphi_n\|_E = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero strongly in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|)$. This is possible by (4.10). We obtain using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\|\psi\|_E=1} \int h(x)u_\lambda^{p-2}\varphi_n\psi &\leq \sup_{\|\psi\|_E=1} \left(\int h(x)u_\lambda^{\frac{(p-2)p}{p-1}} |\varphi_n|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\int h(x)|\psi|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\int h(x)u_\lambda^{\frac{(p-2)p}{p-1}} |\varphi_n|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to zero pointwise almost everywhere and we may use, similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1, Vitali's convergence theorem [16] to deduce that the latter integral tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi_n$ tends to zero in E' , which yields the claim. $\square$

Remark 4.4. *Under assumption (4.10) the operator $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ is not invertible on its range, hence we cannot use the implicit function theorem to prove that the map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is $C^1(J, E)$. Moreover, we may deduce that $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ cannot be a Fredholm operator under assumption (4.10). Conversely, suppose that the codimension of the range of $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ is finite. Then we could decompose E' topologically into $E' = I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)(E) \oplus \mathcal{F}$. Since $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ is injective, the open mapping theorem would yield in this case a continuous inverse on $I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)(E)$, in contradiction to Lemma 4.3.*

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Because V is nonnegative we see that $u_{\lambda'}$ is a strict super-solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for any $\lambda' > \lambda$. Hence by Lemma 2.1 there holds $u_\lambda > u_\mu$ for any $\lambda > \mu$, which gives

$$v_\lambda(x) := \frac{u_\lambda(x) - u_\mu(x)}{\lambda - \mu} > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (4.12)$$

To estimate the growth behavior of u_λ we use an idea given in [15, 20] and try to differentiate $(1.1)_\lambda$ with respect to λ . Because we do not know that the map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda$ is $C^1(J, E)$, we have to work with v_λ . We obtain for all $\varphi \in E$ and $\lambda > \mu$

$$(T(v_\lambda), \varphi) := \int \nabla v_\lambda \nabla \varphi + \int (-\lambda V(x) + h(x) f_{\lambda, \mu}(x)) v_\lambda \varphi = \int V(x) u_\mu \varphi, \quad (4.13)$$

where $f_{\lambda, \mu}(x) := (u_\lambda^{p-1}(x) - u_\mu^{p-1}(x)) (u_\lambda(x) - u_\mu(x))^{-1}$.

Fix $\mu \in (\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V))$ and a principal eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Because u_μ is a positive function and Ω^{-0} is bounded, there is a $C > 0$ such that $u_\mu \geq C e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Consider the function $w_\lambda \in E$ defined by

$$w_\lambda := v_\lambda - \frac{C}{\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) - \lambda} e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V). \quad (4.14)$$

Consequently, by (4.13), we have for all nonnegative $\varphi \in D^{1,2}(\Omega^{-0}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$

$$(T(w_\lambda), \varphi) = \int (V(x) u_\mu - C V(x) e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)) \varphi \geq 0. \quad (4.15)$$

Testing (4.15) with $w_\lambda^- = -\min(w_\lambda, 0) \in D^{1,2}(\Omega^{-0}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$ we see

$$0 \leq (T(w_\lambda), w_\lambda^-) = - (T(w_\lambda^-), w_\lambda^-) \leq 0,$$

because $\lambda < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Hence $w_\lambda \geq 0$ and the claim follows. $\square$

5. RESULTS FOR SIGN-CHANGING h

We give existence and multiplicity results concerning sign-changing h . To this end we need to introduce the set Ω^0 , defined by

$$\Omega^0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid h(x) = 0\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4), $h^- \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) < \infty$. Then we may choose $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha \cdot u_0$ is a positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$, where u_0 is the minimizer of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ obtained in Lemma 3.1.*

Proof. First we shall show that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. Conversely, suppose that this is wrong. (1.4) implies that $\lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$ is attained by some $e_1(\Omega^0, V)$. Because $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ we may choose $\varphi_1 \in E$ such that

$$\int \nabla e_1(\Omega^0, V) \nabla \varphi_1 - \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V) \int V(x) e_1(\Omega^0, V) \varphi_1 < 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Because $h^- \not\equiv 0$ there is $\varphi_2 \in C_c(\{x \mid h(x) < 0\})$ such that

$$\int h(x) |\varphi_1 + \varphi_2|^p < 0. \quad (5.2)$$

By (5.1) and (5.2) we see for small values of $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int h(x)|e_1(\Omega^0, V) + t(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)|^p &= t^p \int h(x)|\varphi_1 + \varphi_2|^p < 0 \text{ and} \\ \frac{\|\nabla(e_1(\Omega^0, V) + t(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2))\|_2^2}{\int V(x)(e_1(\Omega^0, V) + t(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2))^2} &< \frac{\|\nabla e_1(\Omega^0, V)\|_2^2}{\int V(x)e_1(\Omega^0, V)} = \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$.

To obtain a contradiction, suppose $\int h(x)|u_0|^p < 0$. Because the set $\{u \in E \mid \int h(x)|u|^p < 0\}$ is open in E , the function u_0 is a local minimizer of $\inf\{\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \mid \int V(x)|u|^2 = 1\}$. Therefore u_0 is a weak solution of $-\Delta u = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)V(x)u$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Standard regularity results and Harnack's inequality (see [25, C.1]) show that u_0 is a positive and continuous function. Now the estimate (2.35) in Lemma 2.11 contradicts the assumption $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) > \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V)$.

Thus we have $\int h(x)|u_0|^p = 0$. We define $M : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$M(u) := (M_1(u), M_2(u)) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \int V(x)|u|^2, \frac{1}{p} \int h(x)|u|^p \right).$$

Obviously $M \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and for all $u, \varphi \in E$ there holds

$$M'(u)\varphi = \left(\int V(x)u\varphi, \int h(x)|u|^{p-2}u\varphi \right).$$

We have $M'(u_0)u_0 = (1, 0)$. If $\int h(x)|u_0|^{p-2}u_0\varphi = 0$ for all $\varphi \in E$, then $h(x)|u_0|^{p-2}u_0$ is zero almost everywhere, which implies $u_0(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega^0$, contradicting $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. The above arguments show that $M'(u_0)$ is surjective. Because u_0 minimizes $\inf\{\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \mid M(u) = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)\}$ we deduce from the Lagrange rule the existence of $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that for all $\varphi \in E$

$$\int \nabla u_0 \nabla \varphi = \sigma_1 \int V(x)u_0\varphi + \sigma_2 \int h(x)|u_0|^{p-2}u_0\varphi. \quad (5.3)$$

Testing (5.3) with u_0 we get $\sigma_1 = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$. Define $I_{RQ}(u) := \frac{\|\nabla u\|_2^2}{\int V(x)|u|^2}$. Then u_0 minimizes $\{I_{RQ}(u) \mid \int V(x)|u|^2 > 0, \int h(x)|u|^p \leq 0\}$. Take a $\varphi \in E$ with $\int h(x)|u_0|^{p-2}u_0\varphi < 0$. Then we get for all small positive t that $\int h(x)|u_0 + t\varphi|^p \leq 0$. The function u_0 is a minimizer of I_{RQ} in direction of φ , this implies

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{2}I'_{RQ}(u_0)\varphi = \int \nabla u_0 \nabla \varphi - \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \int V(x)u_0\varphi = \sigma_2 \int h(x)|u_0|^{p-2}u_0\varphi.$$

Hence we see $\sigma_2 \leq 0$, which implies $\sigma_2 < 0$, because otherwise we get

$$-\Delta u_0 = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)V(x)u_0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

which is impossible as we have seen before. The claim follows for $\alpha := (-\sigma_2)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}$. $\square$

Corollary 5.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 5.1 the equation $(1.1)_\lambda$ admits an ordered pair of solutions $u_0 < u_1$ for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ such that*

$$I_{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)}(u_0) < 0 = I_{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)}(u_1) = (I''_{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)}(u_1)u_1, u_1).$$

Proof. We let u_1 be the solution given by Lemma 5.1. The second solution u_0 exists due to Lemma 2.1. $\square$

SECOND SOLUTION

We show that I_λ admits a mountain-pass geometry. To this end we fix $\lambda > 0$ and suppose throughout the rest of the section that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied, i.e. we suppose (1.2)-(1.4) and

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \quad (5.4)$$

Moreover, we assume $h^- \not\equiv 0$, which is a necessary condition for the existence of a second positive solution to (1.1) $_\lambda$ (see Theorem 1.1). Because $V \in C(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $h^-(x_0) \neq 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ it is possible to choose a $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ -function φ_0 concentrated at x_0 such that

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \int V(x)|\varphi_0|^2 < \int |\nabla \varphi_0|^2 \text{ and } I_\lambda(\varphi_0) \leq 0. \quad (5.5)$$

We define a set of paths

$$\Gamma := \{\gamma \in C^1([0, 1], E) \mid \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = \varphi_0\}.$$

Lemma 5.3.

$$c := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} I_\lambda(\gamma(t)) > 0$$

Proof. Set $M^+ := \{u \in E \mid \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \int V(x)|u|^2 \leq \|\nabla u\|_2^2\} \neq \emptyset$. First we observe

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \lambda \int V(x)|u|^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)}\right) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \quad \forall u \in M^+. \quad (5.6)$$

With the help of (5.6) we derive for all $u \in M^+$

$$I_\lambda(u) \geq C_1(\lambda) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{p} \int h^-(x)|u|^p \geq C_1(\lambda) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + o(\|\nabla u\|_2^2)_{\|\nabla u\|_2 \rightarrow 0}.$$

Thus there exists $r > 0$ such that $\|\nabla \varphi_0\|_2 > r > 0$ and

$$I_\lambda(u) \geq c_1 > 0 \text{ for all } u \in M^+ \text{ such that } \|\nabla u\|_2 = r. \quad (5.7)$$

Suppose there is a $u_1 \in E$ such that $\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \int V(x)|u_1|^2$. Then the definition of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ and (5.6) imply

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u_1) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 - \lambda \int V(x)|u_1|^2 \right) + \underbrace{\frac{1}{p} \int h(x)|u_1|^p}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\nabla u_1\|_2^2 - \lambda \int V(x)|u_1|^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)} \right) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Let γ be an arbitrary element of Γ . Let

$$t_0 := \max \left\{ t \in [0, 1] \mid \|\nabla(\gamma(t))\|_2^2 = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h) \int V(x)|\gamma(t)|^2 \right\}.$$

Our choice of φ_0 yields that t_0 is attained and $0 \leq t_0 < 1$. If $\|\gamma(t_0)\|_{D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)} \geq r$, then (5.8) shows

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} I_\lambda(\gamma(t)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)} \right) r^2 > 0.$$

If $\|\gamma(t_0)\|_{D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)} < r$, then $\gamma(t) \in M^+$ for all $t \in [t_0, 1]$ and (5.7) shows

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} I_\lambda(\gamma(t)) \geq c_1 > 0.$$

Thus the claim follows. $\square$

By Lemma 5.3 the functional I_λ has a mountain pass geometry. Consequently using versions of the classical mountain pass theorem of Ambrosetti and Rabinowitz [4] given in [5, 10] there exists a $(PS)_c$ sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, i.e.

$$I_\lambda(u_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} c \text{ and } I'_\lambda(u_n)(1 + \|u_n\|_E) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Before we show that such $(PS)_c$ sequences give rise to critical points of I_λ , we observe that it is sufficient to consider special $(PS)_c$ sequences, consisting of almost nonnegative functions.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a $(PS)_c$ sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset E$, i.e.*

$$I_\lambda(u_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} c > 0, \quad I'_\lambda(u_n)(1 + \|u_n\|_E) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \text{ in } E',$$

such that $\text{dist}(u_n, E^+) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where we denote by E^+ the cone of nonnegative functions in E . In the sequel we will call a sequence with these properties a $(PS)_c^+$ sequence.

Proof. Lemma 5.3 shows

$$c := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} I_\lambda(\gamma(t)) > 0.$$

Hence there is a sequence of paths $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{u \in \gamma_n} I_\lambda(u) = c.$$

Because $I_\lambda(u) = I_\lambda(|u|)$ we may assume $\gamma(\cdot) = |\gamma(\cdot)|$. A version of the classical mountain pass theorem in [18, Th. 13.10] shows that there is a $(PS)_c$ sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|u_n - \gamma_n\|_E \rightarrow 0$ by using a deformation argument in the vicinity of almost minimizing paths, which carries over to the work of [5, 10]. Hence the claim follows. $\square$

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset E$ is a $(PS)_c^+$ sequence. Then there exists a nonnegative $u_0 \in E$, such that $I_\lambda(u_0) = c$, $I'_\lambda(u_0) = 0$ and we may assume after going to a subsequence that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in E to u_0 .*

Proof. Let $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a $(PS)_c^+$ sequence as stated above. We have

$$-2c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n - 2I_\lambda(u_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p-2}{p} \int h(x)|u_n|^p. \quad (5.9)$$

Hence the definition of $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ yields

$$c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{p} I'_\lambda(u_n)u_n \right) \geq \frac{p-2}{2p} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)} \right) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla u_n\|_2^2 \quad (5.10)$$

Consequently $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and by (1.3) in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^-)$. The estimate (5.9) now implies that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$. Finally (1.4) and the boundedness of $(I_\lambda(u_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ show that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E .

Because $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E , we may choose a subsequence (still denoted by $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$), which converges weakly to u_0 in E and pointwise almost everywhere. Since $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a $(PS)_c^+$ sequence we have $\|u_n - v_n\|_E \rightarrow 0$ for some nonnegative $v_n \in E$ and $v_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus u_0 is nonnegative, for the cone of nonnegative functions is weakly closed. The sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in E and pointwise almost everywhere to $u_0 \in E$.

Consequently, using for instance Vitali's convergence theorem [16], we have $I'_\lambda(u_0) = 0$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
o(1) &= (I'_\lambda(u_n) - I'_\lambda(u_0))(u_n - u_0) \\
&= \|\nabla(u_n - u_0)\|_2^2 + \lambda \int V^-(x)|u_n - u_0|^2 - \underbrace{\lambda \int V^+(x)|u_n - u_0|^2}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ (} n \rightarrow \infty \text{) by (1.4)}} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\int h^-(x)(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n - u_0^{p-1})(u_n - u_0)}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ (} n \rightarrow \infty \text{) by (1.3)}} + \int h^+(x)(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n - u_0^{p-1})(u_n - u_0) \\
&= o(1) + \|\nabla(u_n - u_0)\|_2^2 + \lambda \int V^-(x)|u_n - u_0|^2 + \underbrace{\int h^+(x)(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n - u_0^{p-1})(u_n - u_0)}_{\geq 0}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

This implies $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^N, |V|)$. By (5.11) and the Brezis-Lieb lemma [8] we obtain

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h^+(x)(|u_n|^{p-2}u_n - u_0^{p-1})(u_n - u_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int h^+(x)u_n^p - \int h^+(x)u_0^p \right),$$

and the uniform convexity of L^p implies $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N, h^+)$. Hence we finally see $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to u_0 in E . $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The assertion of Theorem 1.4 for $\lambda = \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ is an immediate consequence of Corollary 5.2. Note that any solution given by Lemma 2.1 satisfies

$$(I''_\lambda(u_\lambda)\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in E.$$

For $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda < \lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V, h)$ Lemma 5.5 yields the existence of v_λ . Moreover, any solution v_λ , such that $I_\lambda(v_\lambda) > 0$, satisfies due to the homogeneity of the nonlinearity

$$(I''_\lambda(v_\lambda)v_\lambda, v_\lambda) < 0.$$

The claim now follows using again Lemma 2.1. $\square$

6. EXISTENCE FOR $\lambda = \lambda^*$

We show that $(1.1)_\lambda$ is solvable for $\lambda = \lambda^*$ by approximating the desired solution with solutions for $\lambda < \lambda^*$. To justify the passage to the limit we will need that $\lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$, where $\Omega^0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid h(x) = 0\}$.

If h is nonnegative, then λ^* equals $\lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. If $h^- \neq 0$ then we have $\Omega^0 \subsetneq \Omega^{-0}$, hence $\lambda_1(\Omega^0, V) > \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) \geq \lambda^*$ by the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue with respect to the domain. This is a nice, but unfortunately wrong argument because Ω^{-0} need not to be a domain. A counterexample may easily be obtained by choosing a function h vanishing on a large ball B_1 and changing sign only on a smaller second ball B_2 disjoint from B_1 . In that case the eigenfunction corresponding to the first eigenvalue vanishes on the set where h attains negative values and $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ equals $\lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. The next lemma gives some sufficient conditions ensuring that $\lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$, although we believe that $\lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$ whenever $h^- \not\equiv 0$.

Lemma 6.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, if moreover $h^- \not\equiv 0$ and either*

$$\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \text{supp}(h^+) \text{ is connected or} \quad (6.1)$$

$$V \geq 0 \text{ and } 0 < \int h^-(x) e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)^p \quad (6.2)$$

for some principal eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Then $\lambda^ < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$.*

Proof. Under assumption (6.1) Harnack's inequality shows that any principal eigenfunction $e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$ is positive on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid h(x) < 0\}$. Consequently $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) < \lambda(\Omega^0, V)$. From Theorem 1.4 we infer $\lambda^* \leq \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$.

Under the hypothesis (6.2) we suppose contrary to the assertion of the lemma that there is a sequence $(u_n, \lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $E \times (\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V))$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$ monotone increasing as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and u_n is a solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda = \lambda_n$. Lemma 1.6 and Theorem 1.4 show $\lambda_n < \lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)$. Hence $\lambda_1(\Omega^{-0}, V) = \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. By Lemma 2.1 we may assume

$$(I''_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\varphi, \varphi) \geq 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in E \text{ and } I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) < 0.$$

Because V is nonnegative, each u_n is a super-solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $\lambda \leq \lambda_n$ and h replaced by h^+ . We may use Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 1.2 to derive for all n that $u_n \geq u_0$, where u_0 is the unique positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $\lambda = \lambda_2$ and h replaced by h^+ . Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (I''_{\lambda_n}(u_n)e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V), e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)) = -(p-1) \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h^-(x) |u_n|^{p-2} e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)^2 \\ &\leq -(p-1) \int h^-(x) |u_0|^{p-2} e_1(\Omega^{-0}, V)^2, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (6.2). $\square$

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose (1.2)-(1.4), $h^- \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V) < \lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$. Then $(1.1)_\lambda$ is solvable for $\lambda = \lambda^*$.*

Proof. Let $(u_n, \lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $E \times]\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^N, V), \lambda^*]$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and u_n is a positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ for $\lambda = \lambda_n$. By Lemma 2.1 we may assume

$$I_{\lambda_n}(u_n) < 0 \text{ and } (I''_{\lambda_n}(u_n), u_n) \geq 0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.3)$$

Moreover, we have

$$0 \leq (I''_{\lambda_n}(u_n), u_n) - 2I(u_n) \leq (p-2) \int h(x) |u_n|^p. \quad (6.4)$$

From (6.3) and (6.4) we deduce that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E if $(\int V(x) u_n^2)$ is bounded above. To obtain a contradiction we suppose $\sigma_n^2 := \int V(x) u_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and write $w_n := u_n / \sigma_n$. Obviously $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in E and we may assume $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to some $w_0 \neq 0$ in E . There holds for all $\varphi \in E$

$$0 = \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} I'(u_n)\varphi = \int \nabla w_n \nabla \varphi - \lambda \int V(x) w_n \varphi + \sigma_n^{p-2} \int h(x) w_n^{p-1} \varphi. \quad (6.5)$$

Hence $w_0(x) = 0$ for all x such that $h(x) \neq 0$, because we have for all $\varphi \in E$

$$\int h(x) w_0(x)^{p-1} \varphi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h(x) w_n^{p-1} \varphi = 0.$$

By (6.3) and (6.4) we see $\|\nabla w_0\|_2^2 - \lambda^* \int V(x) w_0^2 \leq 0$, contradicting $\lambda^* < \lambda_1(\Omega^0, V)$.

Consequently $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded $(PS)_c^+$ sequence for I_{λ^*} and some $c \leq 0$. By Lemma 5.5 and passing to a subsequence we may assume $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some u_0 in E . Because each u_n is a super-solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $\lambda \leq \lambda_n$ and h replaced by h^+ , we see that $u_n \geq w_0$,

where w_0 denotes the unique positive solution of $(1.1)_\lambda$ with $\lambda = \lambda_2$ and h replaced by h^+ . Consequently $u_0 = 0$ is impossible and the claim follows. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Lemma 6.1 shows that the assumptions of Lemma 6.2 are satisfied. Hence $(1.1)_\lambda$ admits a solution u_{λ^*} for $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Because V is nonnegative u_{λ^*} is a super-solution to $(1.1)_\lambda$ for every $\lambda \leq \lambda^*$. Consequently Lemma 2.1 yields the validity of (i). The assertion of (ii) immediately follows from Theorem 1.7 and the definition of λ^* . $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Hans-Peter Heinz for many helpful suggestions during the preparation of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alama and G. Tarantello. *On semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities*. Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ., **1** (1993), no. 4, 439–475.
- [2] S. Alama and G. Tarantello. *Elliptic problems with nonlinearities indefinite in sign*. J. Funct. Anal., **141** (1996), no. 1, 159–215.
- [3] H. Amann and J. López-Gómez. *A priori bounds and multiple solutions for superlinear indefinite elliptic problems*. J. Differential Equations, **146** (1998), no. 2, 336–374.
- [4] A. Ambrosetti and P. H. Rabinowitz. *Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications*. J. Funct. Anal., **14** (1973), 349–381.
- [5] P. Bartolo, V. Benci and D. Fortunato. *Abstract critical point theorems and applications to some nonlinear problems with “strong” resonance at infinity*. Nonlinear Anal., **7** (1983), no. 9, 981–1012.
- [6] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo Dolcetta and L. Nirenberg. *Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and nonlinear Liouville theorems*. Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal., **4** (1994), no. 1, 59–78.
- [7] H. Berestycki, I. Capuzzo Dolcetta and L. Nirenberg. *Variational methods for indefinite superlinear homogeneous elliptic problems*. NoDEA, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl., **2** (1995), no. 4, 553–572.
- [8] H. Brezis and E. H. Lieb. *A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals*. Proc. Am. Math. Soc., **88** (1983), 486–490.
- [9] K. J. Brown and N. M. Stavrakakis. *On the construction of super- and subsolutions for elliptic equations on all of $\mathbb{R}^N$* . Nonlinear Anal., **32** (1998), no. 1, Ser. A: Theory Methods, 87–95.
- [10] G. Cerami. *An existence criterion for the critical points on unbounded manifolds*. Istit. Lombardo Accad. Sci. Lett. Rend. A, **112** (1978), no. 2, 332–336.
- [11] S. Cingolani and J. L. Gámez. *Positive solutions of a semilinear elliptic equation on $\mathbb{R}^N$ with indefinite nonlinearity*. Adv. Differential Equations, **1** (1996), no. 5, 773–791.
- [12] D. G. Costa and H. T. Tehrani. *Existence of positive solutions for a class of indefinite elliptic problems in $\mathbb{R}^n$* . Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **13** (2001), no. 2, 159–189.
- [13] M. G. Crandall and P. H. Rabinowitz. *Bifurcation from simple eigenvalues*. J. Functional Analysis, **8** (1971), 321–340.
- [14] P. Drábek and Y. X. Huang. *Multiple positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$* . Nonlinear Anal., **37** (1999), no. 4, Ser. A: Theory Methods, 457–466.
- [15] J. García-Melián, R. Gómez-Reñasco, J. López-Gómez and J. C. Sabina de Lis. *Pointwise growth and uniqueness of positive solutions for a class of sublinear elliptic problems*

- where bifurcation from infinity occurs. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **145** (1998), no. 3, 261–289.
- [16] E. Hewitt and K. Stromberg. *Real and abstract analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York (1975). A modern treatment of the theory of functions of a real variable, Third printing, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 25.
 - [17] T. Küpper. *On minimal nonlinearities which permit bifurcation from the continuous spectrum*. Math. Methods Appl. Sci., **1** (1979), no. 4, 572–580.
 - [18] I. Kuzin and S. Pohozaev. *Entire solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (1997).
 - [19] J. López-Gómez. *On the existence of positive solutions for some indefinite superlinear elliptic problems*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **22** (1997), no. 11-12, 1787–1804.
 - [20] J. López-Gómez. *Varying bifurcation diagrams of positive solutions for a class of indefinite superlinear boundary value problems*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **352** (2000), no. 4, 1825–1858.
 - [21] T. Ouyang. *On the positive solutions of semilinear equations $\Delta u + \lambda u + hu^p = 0$ on compact manifolds. II*. Indiana Univ. Math. J., **40** (1991), no. 3, 1083–1141.
 - [22] M. Ramos, S. Terracini and C. Troestler. *Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and Pohožaev type identities*. J. Funct. Anal., **159** (1998), no. 2, 596–628.
 - [23] M. Schneider. *Entire solutions of semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities*. Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz (2001).
 - [24] M. Schneider. *Compact embeddings and indefinite semilinear problems*. Nonlinear Anal., (to appear).
 - [25] B. Simon. *Schrödinger semigroups*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.), **7** (1982), no. 3, 447–526.
 - [26] N. M. Stavrakakis. *Global bifurcation results for semilinear elliptic equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$: The Fredholm case*. J. Differ. Equations, **142** (1998), no. 1, 97–122.
 - [27] M. Struwe. *Variational methods*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edn. (1996). Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems.